

## United States Patent and Trademark Office





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| . 09/723,733  | 11/28/2000      | Isaac B. Horton III  | 1300-009                 | 3630             |
| 7   | 7590 12/20/2001 |                      |                          |                  |
| GLASGOW LAW FIRM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW P.O. BOX 28539 |                 |                      | EXAMINER                 |                  |
|   |                 |                      | THORNTON, KRISANNE MARIE |                  |
| 116 N. WEST ST. SUITE 270<br>RALEIGH, NC 27611-8539       |                 |                      | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,   |                 |                      | 1744                     | C-               |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/20/2001  | 7                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.                                     | Applicant(s)  |
|---|---|---|
| Interview Summary   | 09/723,733<br>Examiner                              | HORTON, ISAAC B.  |
|   | Krisanne M. Thornton                                | 1744  |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT   |   |   |
| (1) Krisanne M. Thornton.   | (3)   |   |
| (2) Atty. JiNan Glasgow.  | (4)   |   |
| Date of Interview: 18 December 2001.  | •   |   |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant  | 2) applicant's represent                            | ative]  |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:   | e)⊠ No.   |   |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>all</u> .  |   |   |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Free and Zhang.  |   | •   |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reache   | d. g)☐ was not reached.                             | h)  |
| Substance of Interview including description of the gene reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation She</u>  | ral nature of what was agreed<br>eet                | I to if an agreement was                                      |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame<br>allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where n<br>allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attac   | o copy of the amendments the                        | agreed would render the claim<br>at would render the claims   |
| i)⊠ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a checked).  | a separate record of the subst                      | ance of the interview(if box is                               |
| Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FOMUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIBUTION AND ACTION HAS AIRCRAFT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVITED FOR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVITED FOR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE | EW. (See MPEP Section 713<br>NE MONTH FROM THIS INT | .04).  If a reply to the last Office<br>ERVIEW DATE TO FILE A |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   | ,   | ANNE THORNTON MARY EXAMINER                                   |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.  | Examiner's s  | signature, if required  |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms Glasgow contacted the examiner to discuss the outstanding office action and her proposed response. It was agreed that the proposed amendment set forth would overcome the 112, 2nd paragraph rejections. Ms. Glasgow argued that neither of the primary references taught or suggested the optical component specifically placed for providing focused and controlled UV, as set forth in independent claim 1. Upon review of the references, the examiner agreed. Ms. Glasgow indicated that she would officially submit the proposed response discussed, along with a terminal disclaimer. The examiner indicated that this would put the case in condition for allowance.